1	DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES
2	MONTGOMERY COUNTY
3	
4	X
5	: IGCC PUBLIC WORK SESSION :
6	: X
7	
8	A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on
9	Wednesday, June 11, 2014, commencing at 2:07 p.m., in the
10	County Office Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, First Floor
11	
12	Auditorium, Rockville, Maryland 20850, before:
13	MARK NAUMAN
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Deposition Services, Inc.

12321 Middlebrook Road, Suite 210 Germantown, MD 20874 Tel: (301) 881-3344 Fax: (301) 881-3338  $in fo @Deposition Services.com \\ www. Deposition Services.com$ 

25



ORIGINAL

## INDEX

STATEMENT OF:	PAGE
Christiane Graham	5
Ralph Bennett	9
Rich Lohymeyer	13
Eileen Emmet	14
Karen Anderson	15

Code.

## PROCEEDINGS

MR. NAUMAN: My name's Mark Nauman with Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services. I want to welcome all of you to our third public session, as we move forward with the adoption of the International Green Construction

We've had some comments which people are finding difficult to be able to move forward this and provide comments, inasmuch as the code is not readily available.

And, due to copyright laws, we can't publish the code.

We're able to publish our proposals, our comments, that kind of stuff, but as far as the entirety of the code, we're not able to publish that.

We are trying to work on a resolution to this and, currently, right now, I've got some books on order that we can make available for use, would prefer, in our office.

Because we're not really a seller of code books, but we may also have a loaner system set up similar to what the public libraries are doing. But, as soon as the books come in, or if we come up with an electronic version, I'm going to be contacting the ICC and see if we can make an electronic version available for the next six months or so, something along those lines. Reggie will have that posted on our website, so as we move forward, keep an eye on this or, like I said, as soon as the books come in we'll have that on our

website as well, and you'd be able to come in during regular business hours and look through the code. It will include both the IGCC and ASHRAE 189 as an entire book.

I'm also ordering copies of the National Green Building Standard, the ICC 700. So that will be available as well for perusal. Once again, this is our third public session. This one is to cover Chapter 6, which focuses on energy. As I've stated previously, the purpose of this is sort of a provocative engagement. We have made proposals, which are just baseline proposals, these are draft proposal to the code, as we move forward. This is a lengthy and complicated process. We are going to be having other public sessions and hearings as we move forward to October 1st, which is our anticipated date to be able to make a finalized version of this presentable to our legislature.

So, any and all comments are welcome. Input, comments, comments upon the proposals that we've made. Once again, they are being posted online. All of these sessions are being transcribed. For accuracy, these transcriptions will also be posted online. And, I'm compiling comments. We've received comments over the last year from various agencies and groups. Some of them are very lengthy documents. And so, I'm in the process of trying to summarize and compile all of these into a metric that, once it's completed, all of the comments that have been presented

to DPS and/or myself, we will be making that available online as well. But, like I said, from week to week, the transcripts of these meetings will be made available.

So, today we have, it looks like three people that are scheduled to speak. We're not limited to just these three people. Like I said, the purpose of this is engagement. So, anything that you may have to comment on, IGCC related only, without straying off into other areas, that would be great. So, I'd like to bring up Christiane Graham. When you come up, stand up here, state your name, have a seat, or you can stand. Please speak loudly, and speak into the speaker, if you're able.

MS. GRAHAM: You want me to stand up?

MR. NAUMAN: Stand or sit, it's up to you.

MS. GRAHAM: My name is Christiane Graham at 4112

Decatur Avenue, Kensington, Maryland 20895. My general

purpose for coming to this particular public work session is

that I'm very concerned about co2 output and climate change.

Although I am a generalist, and I cannot speak to the

specifics of IGCC, it was very difficult to get the

document. I would like to talk about it in general.

I am a resident of Kensington and a member of the Save Kensington group, and we support the adoption of IGCC and all of its comprehensiveness. I want to express my appreciation for this public work session by DPS, the

Maryland legislature, and Governor O'Malley, for signing legislation that keeps Maryland solidly on the green path. Published studies show that green buildings cost less to operate, command higher resell prices, and demonstrated history of leasing up faster, and retaining tenants than non-green buildings.

Our neighborhood is slated for redevelopment as projected by the Kensington Sector Plan, passed in March 2012. I want to draw your attention to four areas. First, the co2 output predictions for our developed neighborhood, second, is the impact on Rock Creek watershed, third, transportation issues, fourth, heat island effect mitigation.

Under the current Kensington Sector Plan, co2 is projected to triple by 2030. This is unacceptable, and reprehensive, pitifully low standard for the county. Co2 reduction is critical for the entire planet, not just Montgomery County. In the years of living dangerously, currently aired on Showtime, demonstrates the dire consequences of playing possum. Several chapters of the IGCC address co2 mitigation. Stormwater treatment and intelligent site development will be crucial to new development in Kensington, and everywhere in the county. Increased runoff from violent storms into Rock Creek is a liability and our responsibility. Likewise, for all streams

in the Chesapeake watershed.

stormwater mitigation. The marc train in Kensington is a commuter rail. We do not have Metro, which is very different from our neighbors in Silver Spring and Bethesda. People traveling in and through Kensington use cars. We want increase in safe bicycle paths, buses and walk areas. But using traffic lights in Kensington will save 25 percent of co2 from idling engines and the increased co2 output when engines are accelerating after each light. We have about eight lights in the very close vicinity, in downtown Kensington, that that's unacceptable.

We must better funnel traffic from cross streets and create foot traffic bridges to mitigate co2. Residents of west and east of Connecticut Avenue shall be friends, and not strangers due to massive rush hour and daytime traffic that divides us. Heat island effect mitigation with green roofs, tree plantings, green walks, is mandated by IGCC. Active solar electricity generation in free standing buildings of 75 feet, 65 feet and 45 feet height are practical here, since there is no shade from trees. Increase natural light, state of the art insulation, user-friendly fenestration in building construction creates better consumer satisfaction and reduces electricity demands.

1	Modern metering technology is essential, as
2	addressed in Chapter 6 of IGCC. Moving our country forward
3	in green development is a lucrative opportunity for
4	architects, developers, and manufacturers. If Germany, my
5	home country, a cold, rainy, northern European country, can
6	generate 74 percent of their one day's energy need by solar
7	we can do the same or better. We cannot afford to continue
8	business as usual. We cannot say it is too big a problem,
9	it's the Chinese are at fault, it will happen later, it is
10	too expensive; these are all excuses and evasions. Climate
11	change is with us now. We can and must do better in
12	Montgomery County. I ask you to embrace and to approve the
13	comprehensive IGCC. Thank you.
14	MR. NAUMAN: Wonderful. Ms. Graham, may I ask a
15	couple of questions?
16	MS. GRAHAM: Yes.
17	MR. NAUMAN: You say you represent or you're with
18	Save Kensington?
19	MS. GRAHAM: Uh-huh.
20	MR. NAUMAN: Your comments, are they personal
21	comments or are they representative of the Save Kensington
22	Group?
23	MS. GRAHAM: Both.

24

Both. May I ask what makes the MR. NAUMAN: group, how many people are in your group or association?

Chapter.

MS. GRAHAM: We are, it's a little difficult to 1 tell, to be honest, because I've recently joined, and I 2 don't know the direct answer to that. But, it is, the 3 meetings are attended by about 10 people. MR. NAUMAN: Okay. 5 MS. GRAHAM: Representing various people in 6 7 Kensington. How often do you have meetings? 8 MR. NAUMAN: Once a month. MS. GRAHAM: 9 MR. NAUMAN: Very good. Can I give you my card? 10 (Discussion off the record.) 11 Thank you very kindly. Okay. 12 MR. NAUMAN: two has declined to speak, so we'll move on to number three, 13 Mr. Stephen Kirk. Mr. Stephen Kirk, come on down. Okay. 14 Frank Bennett? 15 MR. BENNETT: Is there a microphone, or can I 16 17 speak from here? I'd prefer it if you'd come up here. MR. NAUMAN: 18 MR. BENNETT: Good afternoon. Thank you for this 19 opportunity to speak. My name is Ralph Bennett, I live at 20 115 Southwood Avenue in Silver Spring, and my office is at 21 1400 Spring Street in Silver Spring. I'm with Bennett, 22 Frank, McCarthy Architects, but I'm here speaking on behalf 23 of the American Institute of Architects, Potomac Valley 24

As many of you know, the Chapter has been working with Permitting Services since the beginning of last summer, commenting on the International Green Construction Code, and its issues related to its adoption. The AIA, itself, is deeply committed to sustainability. I associate myself with the remarks of the previous speaker in concern about greenhouse gases and the importance of getting them under control soon.

The AIA has a AIA 2030 program, which commits subscribing firms to be designing net zero buildings in total by 2030. That, of course, depends on our clients abilities to do that. But, it's a statement of optimism about the possibilities. Chapter 6 of the IGCC is the critical chapter, obviously, it deals with the energy that is consumed by buildings. It has a number of issues. We had submitted nine pages in comments last summer, which I will not bore you with the recapitulation of. I'll do it by category.

metric for energy consumption is something called the Zero Energy Performance Index, which is invented by this code.

It's an interesting index. It goes from zero to 100, with zero being net zero. The issue for us with the use of this index is that the baseline is energy data from the year 2000. So, if we were to commit to 50 on the ZEPI, it would

be a 50 percent reduction relative to energy consumption in 2000. The figures from 2000 are not universally available, and make it difficult to do that. So, were this index to be adopted, it would require some adjustment in order to really measure our performance, which we agree entirely is an important thing to do.

Many of our recommendations have to do with sticking with the recommendations of the International Energy Conservation Code, which was adopted by the County last year, and whose requirements are requested or required to be exceeded by 10 percent, that requirement we're suggesting to be placed in Appendix A, which constitutes a menu of measures which can be adopted electively. Simply because we think that our clients and builders in the counties are having difficulty reaching the standards of the International Energy Conservation Code, and the curve should not be any steeper than it is in getting our building stock to those levels of performance.

We also have issues about thresholds. There are a number of thresholds below which buildings do not have to comply, but even buildings above the 25,000 square foot, which seems to be the general threshold, it is very expensive for buildings even that size. For example, in controls, automated controls are required, for example, on all the separate electrical components of energy use in

buildings, and doing that on buildings even larger than 25,000 square feet is very difficult if there is not an automated energy monitoring system initially required, which is not required. So, many of these requirements in the code require systems that are building-wide, which are not widely adopted yet, and which we think may constitute a difficulty for our clients to achieve.

And, by the way, this difficulty of achievement has to do with a broader issue of competitiveness in this market with the County. I would urge those considering adoption of this code to look at the District of Columbia's method of adoption of this code, which is considerably different than what we have detected so far here. The modest two pages of suggested changes that were made available today, do not come close to the depth of change which we are recommending for this code, ad the level of change which was incorporated in the adopted IGCC in the District of Columbia.

It's a complicated question, but in D.C., we will be competing as a jurisdiction with D.C. and, of course, with Virginia, which has never heard of the IGCC, I can assure you, because I've spoken to architects there who give me a very puzzled look when I ask what the possibility is of adopting such a code. So, economic competitive based on costs engendered by this code, are an issue for us, I think.

2

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We also, I mentioned that we're proposing making many of these requirements elective by moving them to Appendix A. The other cost related to this, of course, are the costs of enforcement. This is a very complicated code. It also has a built-in alternative compliance path in ASHRAE 189.1, which the AIA also made a series of recommendations on last Fall, for alteration. We tend to favor that code, because there's a good deal more mandatory requirements, and the modeling requirements for energy are much more achievable than are the models which are proposed by the IGCC, which again, I won't bore you with. So, the cost of regulation, together with the cost of construction, together with the metrics, give us concerns. We have submitted our nine pages, and we will submit comments again based on the two pages which came out today. Thank you for your patience.

MR. NAUMAN: Thank you, Ralph. Okay. That's the end of the people that we have scheduled to speak. I see a lot of people here that I know, people that I recognize, that I know have a lot to say, if anybody else wants to come up and talk, that would be great. If not, please, come on up. If you would, please, speak your name.

MR. LOHMEYER: My name is Rick Lohmeyer, L-O-H-M-E-Y-E-R. And, I'm a resident at Kensington. I just want to acknowledge people in my church climate action team, we're

looking to respond to IGCC, and so we had to buy a copy of 1 the document for \$135 or whatever it is, and that's 2 prohibitive for many people. So, I want to acknowledge and appreciate the efforts you're making to get the code available for people to review. I think having them review it at your office is a reasonable compromise, and I think 6 that's appropriate in the circumstance. So, thank you very 7 8 much. MR. NAUMAN: Very good. Thank you. Appreciate 9 10 it. Mark? 11 MR. BENNETT: MR. NAUMAN: Yes? 12 MR. BENNETT: Could I say that our office has a 13 copy of the code. We love it dearly, and will be happy to 14 share it with others. We're at 1400 Spring Street, Suite 15 If people would like to -- my card has the telephone 16 number, give us a call. They can come look at it in Silver 17 18 Spring. Okay. We'll make sure that 19 MR. NAUMAN: information is posted on our website. 20 MR. BENNETT: Thanks. 21 Okay. You may have people knocking 22 MR. NAUMAN:

on your door day and night.

23

24

25

MR. NAUMAN: Okay. Yes?

MR. BENNETT: Fine.

MS. EMMET: Mark, I'm Eileen Emmet, I was on the 1 AIA Potomac Valley improvement. We do have a link to a free 2 version of the codes, and I'll pull that out of my inbox and share it with you. MR. NAUMAN: Okay. If you could either -- Eileen, 5 if you could either send it to Reggie or myself, Reggie would be the best, that way he can just directly attach it 7 to our website. Great, thank you. That's wonderful. 8 (Discussion off the record.) 9 MR. NAUMAN: Yes? 10 MR. LOHMEYER: Do you put testimony that's 11 occurred in hearing one, hearing two, online? 12 MR. NAUMAN: Yes. 13 (Discussion off the record.) 14 MR. NAUMAN: If I may, like I started off with, I 15 am compiling all of that, trying to summarize it, and come 16 up with a useable metric that is not going to be, you know, 17 100 pages long. So, that's not going to be immediately 18 available. Hopefully, early to mid-summer, I will have that 19 completed and up and available for everybody to peruse and 20 comment on. Okay, anybody else? Come on up, Karen. 21 MS. ANDERSON: I just have a question. Can I ask 22 it from here? 23 MR. NAUMAN: Well, if it's a quick question. 24

you able to hear her?

25

MS. ANDERSON: Karen Anderson, Montgomery County Schools. I'm in the Division of Construction, and I read in the code that the energy modeler, this is in the IGCC, not in 189, needs to be certified by an approved accrediting entity. I don't know which entities accredit that are to modelers, and I don't know who would approve them anyway. So, I'm just seeking clarification on that.

MR. NAUMAN: That would be up to the jurisdiction having authority to decide who we would accept. And, that is yet to be determined. In the past, it's been a licensed, state licensed entity, for similar things as dealing with the energy code, and it may follow along those same lines, as opposed to like a HERS Rater. We still have some questions regarding --

MS. ANDERSON: Yeah. We work close with firms that solely do energy modeling.

MR. NAUMAN: Right.

MS. ANDERSON: And then we work with engineering firms that use trained trades or one or the other standard engineering models, and we would just need to know if one of those is not for the --

MR. NAUMAN: Well, like I said, typically, it would be a state licensed entity, like an engineering firm, a private engineer, something like that. Typically, that's what we would be looking at, but that has not yet been

finalized.

MS. ANDERSON: Okay, and I would just caution that some of these energy modeling firms are actually really good. And you want to make sure actually to have engineers on board, but you want to make sure that they qualify, and that that's what they do all the time and they're good at it.

MR. NAUMAN: Well currently, as you know, the Department of Energy approves the use of certain energy modeling, and it those, I think, would work very well, shake hands very well with the IGCC, since the IGCC is deferring back to things like 90.1, and the energy code. I think those types of programs would work very well.

MS. ANDERSON: Yeah they are trained and have certification.

MR. NAUMAN: Correct. And, to comment on Mr.

Bennett's statement about the ZEPI's, Z-E-P-I, that's not really created by this code. ZEPI has been developed a while back. And, there are metrics that this can be measured by. There are some programs that are available.

But, we are talking about that in-house as well. And, but if you take a look at the baseline modeling for, let's say, ASHRAE 90.1, it is using a baseline standard basically from 2003. So, it's not that difficult to be able to come up with modeling numbers for, you know, a baseline building,

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and then what your proposed design is, and do a comparison. But, like I said, there are programs available specifically for this purpose.

And, you know, once again, things like this help to develop innovation and create, you know, new technologies, new methods and materials to be able to deal with what our goals are here. And, so I'm sure as we move forward, things like, you know, the inclusion of ZEPI into the code, will not be quite so painful. Especially since monitoring, building monitoring, you know, performance of all energy, and water being used by the building is now being mandated by the code, plus the 2015 IECC is coming out. And, as you know, that's based upon ASHRAE 90.1 as its And, it's already been determined that the baseline. current, the new iteration of 90.1 is between 7 and 9 percent more stringent than the previous version. So, that 10 percent, we may be dealing with that anyway, with or without the IGCC. So, that's something to keep in mind as, you know, we mull this over.

MR. BENNETT: To the extent this technology is still being invented, we suggest gradualism in the adoption, and the use of some other codes as alternatives, like LEED, in the beginning stages of the adoption of this code.

MR. NAUMAN: Understood. All right. If there's no other comments. Hadi, do you have anything you'd like to

say?

MR. MANSOURI: No, I don't have anything else, other than asking if there's anything else that you guys want to share with us.

MR. NAUMAN: All right, well, then we'll adjourn, and we'll be back here again next week for Chapter 7, which is we're going to be getting our feet wet, let's put it that way. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 2:33 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

## $\underline{\vee}$ Digitally signed by Keena Lukacinsky

## ELECTRONIC CERTIFICATE

DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that the foregoing pages represent an accurate transcript of the electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services, in the matter of:

IGCC PUBLIC WORK SESSION

Keena Lukacinsky

June 14, 2014